

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Assignee: iRobot Corporation

Applicant: Daniel N. Ozick

Examiner: Unknown

Patent Application No.: Unknown

Art Unit: Unknown

Filed: 22 July 2003

Title: CAPACITIVE SENSOR SYSTEMS AND METHODS WITH INCREASED
RESOLUTION AND AUTOMATIC CALIBRATION

Attorney Docket: ISR-010CON

Certificate of Express Mail

I hereby certify that the attached correspondence is being deposited, under 37 CFR 1.10, with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" Label No. EV 118 869 965 US on July 22, 2003, addressed to Mail Stop Patent Application, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Signature of person mailing correspondence: 

Sunshine S. E. Limanni

Mail Stop PATENT APPLICATION
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

PRELIMINARY AMENDMENT

Sir:

This is a preliminary amendment to the above-identified patent application, which is a continuation of U.S. patent application Serial No. 10/038,111 pursuant to 37 CFR §1.53(b).

HISTORY OF PARENT - U.S. PATENT APPLICATION SERIAL NO. 10/038,111:

Office Action:

Pursuant to the Office Action issued 23 April 2003 in connection with the above-identified patent application:

- Claims 1-3, 5, 16, 20, 21-23, 25, 36, and 40 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by West et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,831,597) for the reasons presented in Paragraph 2 of the Office Action.
- Claims 4 and 24 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over West et al. (the '597 patent) in view of Aggarwal (U.S. Patent No. 3,569,727) for the reasons presented in Paragraph 3 of the Office Action.
- Claims 6-14, 18-19, 26-34, and 38-39 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over West et al. (the '597 patent) in view of Tagg et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0067451) for the reasons set forth in Paragraph 4 of the Office Action.
- Claim 41 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over West et al. (the '597 patent) in view of Herbert (U.S. Patent No. 5,777,596) for the reasons presented in Paragraph 5 of the Office Action.
- Claim 42 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over West et al. (the '597 patent) in view of Dickinson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,049,620) for the reasons set forth in Paragraph 6 of the Office Action.
- Claims 15 and 35 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim (claims 1 and 21, respectively) but have been identified as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims - see Paragraph 7 of the Office Action.
- Claims 17 and 3 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim (claims 1 and 21, respectively) but have been identified as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims - see Paragraph 8 of the Office Action.
- The drawings stand objected to for the reasons presented in Paragraph 1 of the Office Action.

Reply to Office Action:

In response to the above-identified Office Action, the Applicant submitted, on 23 July 2003, a Reply wherein:

- Claims 1-14, 16, 18-34, 36, and 38-42 were canceled without prejudice.
- Claims 15, 17, 35, and 37 were amended in response to the Office Action.
- New claims were added, i.e., claims 43-46, since the original allowable claims either included multiple dependent claims in their dependency chain (15 and 35) or were multiple dependent claims (17 and 37)
- Amended the specification (the amendments to the specification of U.S. patent application serial No. 10/038,111 have been incorporated in the concurrently-filed Rule 53(b) continuation patent application).
- Submitted ten (10) sheets of formal drawings, which were responsive to the objections raised in PTO Form 948 and included changes to the drawings in response to the Examiner's objections. In addition, these formal drawings included changes to the drawings to truncate descriptive legends, add reference numerals to define with greater particularity elements of the invention, and to ensure consistency between the written specification and the drawings (the formal drawings, as amended, are being filed with the concurrently-filed Rule 53(b) continuation patent application)